BEFORE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON

IN THE MATTER OF SEATTLE IRON and METALS CORPORATION,

Appellant,

٧.

PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY.

Respondent.

PCHB No. 85-248

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

THIS MATTER, the appeal of a civil penalty of \$400 for the violation of opacity limitations, came on for hearing in Seattle, Washington, on March 24, 1986, before the Pollution Control Hearings Board; Wick Dufford (presiding), Gayle Rothrock and Lawrence J. Faulk.

Appellant Seattle Iron and Metals Corporation was represented by its operations manager, Marc Sidell. Keith McGoffin, attorney-at-law, represented the respondent Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA). The proceedings were recorded by Bibi Carter.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were admitted and

5 F No 9928--- OS--8-67

Ĺ 2

3

4

ŏ

5

3

•

J

S 4

5

ò

examined. Argument was heard. From the testimony, evidence and contentions of the parties the Board makes these

PINDINGS OF FACT

I

Appellant Seattle Iron and Metals Corporation operates a metals recycling facility on Harbor Island near the mouth of the Duwamish River in Seattle, Washington,

The facility includes a furnace in which clean aluminum is sweated from iron and other metals.

ΙI

Respondent PSAPCA is a municipal corporation with responsibility for a program of air pollution prevention and control in a multi-county area, within which lies the Duwamish estuary and the site of appellant's facilty.

PSAPCA has filed a certified copy of its Regulation I with this Board and we take notice of its contents.

III

On the morning of October 29, 1985, a PSAPCA inspector on routine patrol spotted a black plume from appellant's aluminum sweat furnace stack at a distance of about a mile. The inspector proceeded to the visual opacity readings at site made a distance plant and feet southeast of the stack. The View was approximately 500 unobstructed; the sun was situated within a 140 degree sector to the inspector's back. The sky provided a clearly contrasting background to the perpendicular plume. The wind was from the north-northeast at

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-248

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

 $^{1}4$

15

16

17

18

19

 0°

7.1

19

23

44

25

26

 27°

one to five miles per hour.

1

2

3

4

5

ì

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

In a fifteen minute observation period, PSAPCA's inspector observed that the black plume at its point of highest density reached a 25 to 60 percent plume opacity for seven and three-fourths minutes. The inspector also took photographs of the plume which verify his visual observations.

ΙV

Appellant's aluminum sweat furnace is equipped: with thermocoupler valve which controls combustion and contributes to the control of particulate emissions. On the morning of October 29, 1985, this valve malfunctioned with the result that smoke of unusually high emitted. The problem was unanticipated upset density was aπ The company, however, made no immediate report of the condition. problem to PSAPCA.

٧

The Duwamish area, including the appellant's plant site, is in a non-attainment area for particulate, meaning that the national primary ambient air quality standard for this contaminant is not consistently maintained. The standard is set at a level calculated to protect public health.

VI

PSAPCA's inspector advised supervisory personnel at Seattle Iron and Metals of the results of his opacity readings immediately after he took them. He issued Notice of Violation No 21205 while at the company's office.

Subsequently, on November 21, 1985, the agency issued Notice and

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF TWW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-7 Order of Civil Penalty No. 6378, asserting a violation of Section 9.03(b) of PSAPCA Regulation I and of WAC 173-400-040(1), and assessing a fine of \$400.

Seattle Iron and Metals filed its appeal of this notice and order on December 5, 1985.

VII

Appellant's aluminum sweat furnace has been in operation for over ten years and is relatively old by industry standards. Normally it functions without opacity violations and no further difficulties with excessive smoke have been experienced since October 29, 1985.

However, company's prior record of compliance is one of numerous opacity violations over the past fifteen years. Three of these have involved the aluminum sweat furnace, the most recent previous citation having been issued for events on December 28, 1983.

VIII

Any Conclusion of Law which is deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings, the Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

τ

The Board has jurisdiction over the issues and the parties.

ΙI

PSAPCA Regulation I, Section 9.03(b) prohibits opacity exceeding 20% for more than three minutes in any one hour. WAC 173-400-040(1) is to the same effect.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER

27 PCHB No. 85-248

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

-4

15

16

17

18

19

20

11

99

23

24

25

We conclude that these standards were exceeded by emissions from appellant's aluminum sweat furnace stack on October 29, 1985.

III

Appellant's defense rests primarily on the assertion that the incident arose from an equipment malfunction beyond its control. The company also contends that for the operator to have taken the time to call the air pollution control agency would have made matters worse, because he needed to concentrate fully on correcting the problem.

These arguments are based on a misperception of the Washington Clean Air Act and its implementing regulations. The statute and agency rules present a strict liability regime. Exceeding the regulatory standards is a violation regardless of the reasons for the occurrence. Commercial and industrial operations are required to comply at all times.

Accordingly, although Section 9.17 of Regultion I calls for an immediate report of a breakdown or upset, such reporting does not operate to excuse any violation which may attend the problem. Further, that a breakdown or upset was unforeseen and did not arise through intentional or negligent conduct is here irrelevant to the question of legal responsibility for a resulting violation.

IV

We conclude, therefore, that the assessment of a penalty for violation of Section 9.03(b) and WAC 173-400-040(l) against Seattle Iron and Metals was proper. Moreover, we decide that, in light of all the circumstances, the amount of the penalty was reasonable and should

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-248

j

1	be upheld.
2	v
3	Any Finding of Fact which is deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby
4	adopted as such.
5	From these Conclusions, the Board enters this
6	ORDER
7	The Notice and Order of Civil Penalty (No. 6378) is affirmed.
8	DONE this 31st day of March, 1986.
9	POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
10	
i 1	WICK DUFFORD, Lawyer Member
12	WYCK DUFFORD, Lawyer Member
13	La Ce Rothrock
14	GATLE BOTHROCK, Vice-Chairman
15	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array}$
16	LAWRENCE D FAULK, Chairman
.7	Entrance of Thomas, Charleman,
18	
19	
20	
21	
<u>:2</u>	
,3	•
24	
25	
26	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
27	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & ORDER PCHB No. 85-248 6